5.0 OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

Section 15126 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that the EIR include a discussion of significant environmental effects of the proposed project, significant environmental effects which cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented, significant irreversible changes which would be involved in the proposed project should it be implemented, growth-inducing impacts of the proposed project, the mitigation measures proposed to minimize the significant effects, and alternatives to the proposed project. Cumulative impacts are discussed under each environmental issue area in Chapter 3.0, pursuant to Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines. Alternatives are analyzed in Chapter 4.0 of this document.

The following discussion will focus on a summary of significant environmental effects, growth-inducing impacts, and mitigation measures for the proposed project.

5.1 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Section 15126.2(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of any significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by the proposed project should it be implemented:

> Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse there after unlikely. Primary impacts, and particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

The construction and implementation of the proposed project would entail the commitment of energy and human resources. This commitment of energy, personnel, and building materials would be commensurate with that of other projects of similar magnitude. Manpower would also be committed to the construction of buildings and infrastructure necessary to support the new development.

Ongoing maintenance of the project site would entail a long-term commitment of energy resources in the form of natural gas and electricity. Long-term impacts would also result from an incremental increase in vehicular traffic, and the associated air pollutant and noise emissions. This commitment of energy resources would be a long-term obligation because, practically speaking, it is impossible to return the land to its original condition once it has been developed. However, as established in the Initial Study, the impacts of increased energy usage would not be considered significant adverse environmental impacts due to the small size of the proposed project.

In summary, implementation of the proposed project would involve the following irreversible environmental changes to existing natural resources:

1. Commitment of energy and water resources as a result of the operation and maintenance of the proposed residential units and roadways
2. Alteration of the existing topographic character of the site

5.2 SIGNIFICANT, UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

The following are significant, unavoidable adverse impacts that would result from project implementation. A detailed discussion of each of the impacts can be found in Chapter 3.0 (Environmental Impact Analysis) of this EIR.

Aesthetics

Visual Impacts of Grading

The amount of grading resulting from the proposed project would be extensive since the existing geologic conditions of the project site require extensive cut-and-fill of earthen material to prepare the site for project development. A grading plan has been developed by Kudrave Architects, in cooperation with Spindler Engineering Corporation, and general use of appropriate grading techniques to reduce impacts to natural topography is anticipated. However, because significant landforms, ridgelines, and hillsides would be altered by project-related grading, this is considered significant and unavoidable impact. Mitigation Measures AES-1, AES-2, and AES-3 are proposed to minimize the effects of project grading, but the impact will remain ***significant and unavoidable***.

Impacts to Existing Viewsheds

Proposed project development would result in the visual degradation of long-range and mid-range views, as well as ridgeline views of the project site by grading and elimination of some existing natural hillsides and natural vegetation. Visual quality of the site would be diminished due to the loss of open space and related scenic views of the project site. Impacts to the existing viewsheds would be considered ***significant and unavoidable***.

Biological Resources

The proposed project would not be consistent with General Plan Policies 4.1 and 4.2 of the Environmental Resource Management Element and Policy 3.1 of the Land Use Element. Although the project would include a conservation easement or other deed restriction on 18.36 acres, it would still impact approximately 34.28 acres of mostly native vegetation] and permanently remove 1.25 acres of riparian vegetation and streambed (1.18 acres of oak woodland and 0.11 acre of ephemeral channel). These impacts would result in the project not being in substantial conformity with these Goals and would therefore be in conflict with the Thresholds of Significance listed within Section 3.3 (Biological Resources) of this document. As no mitigation is applicable to this impact, it would remain a ***significant and unavoidable*** impact.

Geology and Soils

The Vista-Amargosa soil association on most of the hillsides has severe limitations for the use of private sewage disposal systems. The geotechnical report (J. Byer Group, 2001, p.12) states that private disposal systems *may* be feasible for these five lots in the cut portion of the project site that would not be served by the public sewer system.

The Hillside Development Ordinance (Chapter 11.35, Title 11 Zoning, La Cañada Flintridge Municipal Code) requires a hydrology report for sites where alteration to the existing topography is proposed, as at this project site (HD §11.35.050 A.7). HD §11.35.050 A.7.c.iii requires the report to contain a concluding statement evaluating the ability of the proposed sewage disposal system to meet the absorption capacity requirements of Los Angeles County's standards for private sewage disposal systems. The information in the geotechnical report does not discharge this requirement, or currently allow a determination of the feasibility of installing seepage pits at the proposed locations.

As the project applicant cannot currently demonstrate the feasibility of the seepage pits due to the lack of site-specific absorption capacity values as defined by the Hillside Development Ordinance, or currently provide a viable alternative (e.g., connection to the public sewer system), there is no feasible mitigation and impacts of the proposed private disposal systems would be ***significant and unavoidable***.

Land Use

The proposed project would not be consistent with General Plan Policies 3.1 of the Land Use Element; 4.1 and 4.2 of the Environmental Resource Management Element; 4.1 of the Community Design Element; and Policies B, C, D, and H of the City's Hillside Ordinance. As no mitigation measures could reduce these inconsistencies, impacts, both cumulative and direct, would be ***significant and unavoidable***.

Utilities

As the project applicant cannot currently demonstrate the feasibility of the seepage pits due to the lack of site-specific absorption capacity values as defined by the Hillside Development Ordinance, or currently provide a viable alternative (e.g., connection to the public sewer system), there is no feasible mitigation and impacts of the proposed private disposal systems would be *significant and unavoidable*.

5.3 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

Section 15126 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that this section discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Growth-inducing impacts are caused by those characteristics of a project that tend to foster or encourage population and/or economic growth. Inducements to growth include the generation of construction and permanent employment opportunities in the support sector of the economy. The proposed project could result in the following types of growth-inducing impacts: (1) the creation of short-term employment opportunities to draw newcomers to the region; (2) the increase in housing; and (3) visitor generation.

Employment Generation

Short-Term Employment Generation

Development of the proposed project would generate some short-term, construction-related employment opportunities. The construction phases of the project would require a limited labor force, due to the relatively short-term nature of construction employment. Given the supply of construction workers in the local work force, it is likely that these workers would come from within the La Cañada Flintridge area. Therefore, given the availability of local workers, the proposed project would not be considered growth inducing from a short-term employment perspective.

Long-Term Employment Generation

The proposed project consists of a maximum of 17 residential units and does not propose any commercial or industrial development. Therefore, the proposed project does not provide any long-term employment.

Population Generation and Housing

Since the proposed project is a residential development, it will directly result in an increase in the number of people who reside in the city. Based on the most recent household size of 3.025, the proposed 17 residential units will house approximately 51 people when fully occupied. This represents approximately a 0.2 percent increase in the number of people who currently reside in the city.

The project does involve the expansion or extension of infrastructure facilities onto the project site and, therefore, will result in additional infrastructure capacity that might induce further growth in the area. However, under the density regulations and minimum lot size requirements of the City's Hillside Ordinance, the site would allow no further development and would not, therefore, produce any future increases in population.

Visitor Generation

Development of the proposed project would not increase the City's recreational opportunities, as pre-existing nature trails will remain in their current state within the community located primarily within the western half of the project site. These recreational opportunities would most likely only serve residents in the immediate vicinity and would not be of use to a large populace in the region. Therefore, it is unlikely that there would be significant visitor generation as a result of the proposed project. In addition, since the proposed project involves permanent City residential housing units, there would be no increase in tourist accommodations.

5.4 EFFECTS NOT FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The Initial Study, attached hereto as Appendix A, determined that several impacts were not found significant within the issue areas of air quality, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, and transportation/traffic. No significant impacts were identified with respect to energy and mineral resources, which are not analyzed in this EIR. Please

refer to Appendix A (Initial Study) for a detailed explanation of the reasons these effects were not found to be significant.

6.0 ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONSULTED/LIST OF EIR PREPARERS

6.1 ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONSULTED

The following organizations and persons were contacted for information during the preparation of this EIR.

Table 6-1 Organizations and Persons Consulted

Name	*Agency/Organization*
Frederick Buss	City of La Cañada Flintridge
Salvie McFarlane	Valley Water Company
David Crocchi	Valley Water Company
Victor Horchar	VHBC, Inc.
Sabrina Simonian	Solid Waste Recycling and Disposal
Gill Matthew	Battalion Chief of Los Angeles County Fire Station No. 82
Susan Laebo	Superintendent of La Cañada Unified School District
Marc Shores	Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority
Peter Kudrave	Kudrave Architects
Priya Finnemore	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Jim Noenick	Sergeant, Crescenta Valley Sheriff's Station
Betty Courtney	California Department of Fish and Game
Valerie Carrillo	State Water Resources Control Board
Laura Stotler	City of Glendale

6.2 LIST OF EIR PREPARERS

This EIR was prepared by EIP Associates, under contract to the City of La Cañada Flintridge. Assisting EIP Associates in this task were two subconsultants, City of La Cañada Flintridge staff members, public service providers, and the Project Applicant. The following specific organizations, agencies, and persons were directly involved in the preparation of this EIR.

It is recognized that no one individual can be an expert in all of the environmental analysis presented in this EIR. Consequently, an interdisciplinary team, consisting of technicians and experts in various issue areas, was required to prepare and complete this study. Table 6-2 provides a list of EIR preparers.

Table 6-2 List of EIR Preparers

Name	*Issue Area*
LEAD AGENCY: CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE	
Frederick Buss, Senior Planner	Project Manager
EIR CONSULTANT: EIP ASSOCIATES	
John Spranza	Project Management, Executive Summary, Introduction, Environmental Analysis, Biological Resources, Recreation, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Traffic and Circulation, Alternatives, Other CEQA Considerations
Kelsey Bennett	Project Management, Project Description, Aesthetics, Public Services, Population and Housing, Alternatives, Other CEQA Considerations
Scott Wirtz	Air Quality, Noise, Hazards and Hazardous Materials
Alison Rondone	Utilities and Service Systems
Neill Brower	Cultural Resources
Michael Brown	Air Quality, Noise
George Burwasser	Geology and Soils
Tamarine Weule	Land Use and Planning
Joel Miller	Document Production, Word Processing
John Osako	Word Processing
James Songco	Graphics
EIR SUBCONSULTANTS	
Bryan Mayeda, Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc.	Traffic and Circulation
George Chan, GKC Corp.	Hydrology and Water Quality
Steven Anderson, Tetra Tech, Inc.	Hydrology and Water Quality
PROJECT APPLICANT	
Kudrave Architects	

7.0 REFERENCES

Abrams, L. 1923. *Illustrated Flora of the Pacific States*. Volumes I, II, and III. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.

———. 1960. *Illustrated Flora of the Pacific States*. Volume IV. Stanford University Press: Stanford, CA.

Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. 1972, amended 1974, 1975, 197, 1979, 1991, and 1993. California Public Resources Code, Division 2. *Geology, Mines, and Mining*. Chapter 7.5, "Earthquake Fault Zones," Sections 2621 through 2630.

Bennett, A. F. 1990. Habitat corridors and the conservation of small mammals in a fragmented forest environment. *Landscape Ecol*. 4:109-122.

Borderdt, D., *et al.* 1975. *Maximum Earthquake Intensity Predicted on a Regional Scale,* United States Geological Survey, Miscellaneous Field Investigations Map MF-09, scale: 125,000, 22 December.

California. 1998. *Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act*.

———. 2002. California Environmental Quality Act, Statutes and Guidelines. Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Sacramento.

———. 2002. Fish and Game Code of California.

———. Department of Finance. 2003a. *City/County Population and Housing Elements, April 1, 1990.* http://www.dof.ca.gov/, January.

———. Department of Finance. 2003b. *Official U.S. Census Counts as of April 1, 2000.* http://www.dof.ca.gov/, January.

———. Department of Finance. 2003c. *Official State Estimates as of January 1, 2002.* http://www.dof.ca.gov/, January.

———. Department of Fish and Game. 2002. Rarefind Database. California Department of Fish and Game, Natural Heritage Division, Sacramento, CA, January.

———. Governor's Office of Planning and Research. 2002. CEQA: *California Environmental Quality Act, Statutes and Guidelines*. Sacramento.

California Geological Survey (formerly Division of Mines and Geology). 1982. Part IV, Classification of Sand and Gravel Resource Areas San Gabriel Valley Production Consumption Region in *Mineral Land Classification of the Greater Los Angeles Area*, Plate 4.5, Pasadena Quadrangle, Special Report 143, scale 1 inch = 4,000 feet.

———. 1999. State of California Seismic Hazard Zones, Pasadena Quadrangle, Official Map in *Seismic Hazard Evaluation of the Pasadena 7.5-Minute Quadrangle, Los Angeles County, California*, Open File Report 98-05, scale 1:24,000, California Geological Survey Seismic Hazards Mapping Program web site at http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/download/ pdf/ozn_pasa.pdf, March 25.

California Integrated Waste Management Board. 2003. Website: www.ciwmb.ca.gov

California Native Plant Society (CNPS). 2002. Electronic Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California. California Native Plant Society: Sacramento, CA.

California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB). 2002. List of special plants. Heritage section, California Department of Fish and Game, January.

California Wilderness Coalition. 2000. Missing Linkages: Restoring Connectivity to the California Landscape. Prepared by the California Wilderness Coalition, November.

Crescenta Valley Water District. 2003. Website: www.cvwd.com

Crocchi, David. 2002. Personal communication with Valley Water Company, November.

EIP Associates. 2002. *Wetland and Jurisdictional Delineation, Tentative Tract 53647*. La Cañada Flintridge, CA, December.

Gardner, Robert. 2003. Personal communication with City of Pasadena Department of Public Works, March.

Garrett, K., and J. Dunn. 1981. *Birds of Southern California: Status and Distribution*. Los Angeles Audubon Soc., Los Angeles, CA. 408 pp.

Gil, Matthew. 2002. Personal communication with Battalion Chief of Los Angeles County Fire Station No. 82, December.

———. 2003. Personal communication with Battalion Chief of Los Angeles County Fire Station No. 82, January.

Harris, L. D., and P.B. Gallagher. 1989. New Initiatives for Wildlife Conservation: The Need for Movement Corridors. Pages 11-34 in G. Mackintosh, ed., *Preserving Communities and Corridors*. Defenders of Wildlife: Washington, DC. 96 pp.

Hart, E.W., and Bryant, W.A. 1997, supplements 1 and 2, 1999; update, July 29, 2002. *Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act with Index to Earthquake Fault Zones Maps*, California Geological Survey, Special Publication 42.

HelpCity.com. 2003. La Cañada Flintridge City Profile. Website: www.helpcity.com/CALaCañada_Flintridge/cityprofile/profile.asp

Holland, R. F. 1986. *Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California*. Non-Game Heritage Program, State of California Department of Fish and Game: Sacramento, CA.

Holland, V. L., and David J. Keil. 1989. *California Vegetation*. California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo. El Corral Publications: San Luis Obispo, CA.

J. Byer Group, Inc. September 24, 2001. *Geologic and Soils Engineering Exploration, proposed 17 Lot Subdivision, Tentative Tract 53647* for Kudrave Architects, map scale 1 inch = 60 feet.

Jennings, C.W. 1994. *Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent Areas, with Locations and Ages of Recent Volcanic Eruptions*, California Geological Survey, Geologic Data Map No. 6, scale 1:750,000.

Kudrave Architects. 2002. *Tentative Tract Map No. 53647, La Cañada Flintridge, California*. Revised 17 April.

La Cañada Flintridge, City of. 1980. *Comprehensive General Plan*. Circulation Element. Adopted May 1995.

———. 1980. *Comprehensive General Plan*. Environmental Resource Management Element. Adopted March 1980.

———. 1980. *The General Plan*, Appendix Figure III-3.

———. 1993. *General Plan.* Adopted 15 November.

———. 1993. General Plan Land Use and Environmental Resource Management Elements, 1980, 1993.

———. 1994. *Comprehensive General Plan*. Adopted March 1980.

———. 1994. *Comprehensive General Plan.* Circulation Element. Adopted March 1980.

———. 1994. *Comprehensive General Plan*. Land Use Element. Adopted April 1993.

———. 1995. *Comprehensive General Plan*. Adopted May 1995.

———. 1999. *La Cañada Flintridge Municipal Code, Title 7, Buildings and Construction*, Chapter 7.08 Building Code, §7.08.010 (adoption of code).

———. 2003. Municipal Code. Website: http://ordlink.com/codes/ lacanada/index.htm.

———. n.d. Municipal Code Noise Ordinance.

———. n.d. Municipal Code Section 11.35, Hillside Development.

———. n.d. www.ci.pasadena.ca.us/humanservices/Recreation_services.asp.

———. n.d. www.laCañadaflintridge.com/city/index.htm.

Laebo, Sue. 2002. Personal communication with Superintendent of La Cañada Unified School District, December.

———. 2003. Personal communication with Superintendent of La Cañada Unified School District, January.

Leininger, David. 2003. Letter from the County of Los Angeles Fire Department responding to request for information, dated 30 January.

Los Angeles, City of. Stormwater Management Division. 2001. Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan for Los Angeles County and Cities in Los Angeles County.

Los Angeles, County of. 1999. *Planning Department Urban Services Analysis*, March.

Los Angeles County Bureau of Engineering. *Sewer Design Manual, Part F*.

Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts. 2002. *Puente Hills Landfill Brochure*. Website: www.lacsd.org/swaste/ Publications/NewPHLFbrochure.htm

Los Angeles County Fire Department. 1996. LAC Fire Code.

Los Angeles Metropolitan Water District. 2002. *Report on Metropolitan's Water Supplies*, 11 February.

MacArthur, R. H., and E. O. Wilson. 1967. *The Theory of Island Biogeography*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ.

McFarlane, Salvie. 2002. Personal communication with Valley Water Company, November.

McKenna *et al.* 2001. *A Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation of the Parker and Johnson Property in La Cañada Flintridge Area, Los Angeles County, California*, September.

Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc. 2003. *Traffic Impact Analysis, Tentative Tract map 53647, La Cañada Flintridge California*, January 14.

Munz, P.A. 1974. *A Flora of Southern California*. University of California Press: Berkeley, CA.

Noenick, Jim. 2002. Personal communication with Sergeant of Crescenta Valley Sheriff's Station, December.

———. 2003. Personal communication with Sergeant of Crescenta Valley Sheriff's Station, January.

Noss, R. F. 1983. A Regional Landscape Approach to Maintain Diversity. *BioScience* 33:700-706.

Oakeshott, G.B. 1978. *California's Changing Landscapes, A Guide to the Geology of the States, 2nd Edition.* McGraw-Hill Book Company, San Francisco.

Pasadena, City of. 2002. *Arroyo Seco Master Plan Master EIR*, 16 May.

RWQCB (Regional Water Quality Control Board). 2001. *Water Quality Control Plan: Los Angeles Region Basin Plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties*.

Sawyer, J.O., and T. Keeler-Wolf. 1995. *A Manual of California Vegetation*. California Native Plant Society: Sacramento, CA.

Simberloff, D., and J. Cox. 1987. Consequences and Costs of Conservation Corridors. *Conser. Biol*. 1:63–71.

Simonian, Sabrina. 2002. Personal communication with Solid Waste Recycling and Disposal, November.

Smith, Steve, Ph.D. 2003. Personal communication with CEQA Program Supervisor, South Coast Air Quality Management District, 6 March.

Soule, M.E. 1987. *Viable populations for conservation*. Cambridge Univ. Press: New York, NY.

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 1993. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*.

———. 1997. *1997 Air Quality Management Plan*.

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 1996. *Regional and Comprehensive Plan and Guide*.

———. 2000. *SCAG Population, Housing, and Employment Forecasts*.

———. 2001. *2001 Regional Transportation Plan Update*.

———. 2003a. *Adopted RHNA Construction Need (Nov. '00): Final Adopted Numbers by Income*, January.

———. 2003b. SCAG RHNA99: *Adopted Existing Need—All Incomes Housing Problems Detail*, January.

Spindler Engineering Corporation, 2001. Hydrology and Preliminary Hydraulics for Tentative Tract 53647, August.

———. 2001. Slope Density Study for Tract No. 53647.

———. 2001, 2003. Slope Density Study by Lot for Tract No 53647.

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRQB). 2001. *General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit*.

Stebbins, R. C. 1985. *A Field Guide to Western Reptiles and Amphibians*. 2nd ed. Houghton-Mifflin Company: Boston, MA.

Stotler, Laura. 2003. Personal communication with City of Glendale Principal Planner, 7 February.

Thomas Bros. Maps. 2002. *The Thomas Guide: Los Angeles and Orange Counties.*

U.S. Census Bureau. 2003a. *Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000 for La Cañada Flintridge City, California*. http://www.census.gov/, January.

———. 2003b. *Profile of Selected Housing Characteristics: 2000 for La Cañada Flintridge City,* California. http://www.census.gov/, January.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Resources Conservation Services (formerly the Soil Conservation Service). 1977. *Soil Survey of Los Angeles County, California*, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). PA 1971. Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment and Home Appliances, PB 206717.

———. PA 1971. 2000. *Stormwater Phase II Final Rule (EPA No. 833-F-00-0001)*, January.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 1960 (photorevised 1988). 7.5-minute series topographic map for Pasadena, CA.